

-----Original Message-----

From: scitechmarketing@charter.net [mailto:scitechmarketing@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2009 5:31 PM
To: Internet, Env (ENV)
Subject: omments Wind Energy Siting Reform Act (H.B. 3065, S.B. 1504)Fwd:
Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

Hello Commissioner,
The original email bounced back. (below) Here it is again.
Thanks for the opportunity to be heard. Lets not loose the option to others.
Charles Michael Toomey.

To:
Honorable Michael W. Morrissey
Commissioner Philip Giudice
Commissioner Rick Sullivan

I oppose the Wind Energy Siting Reform Act (H.B. 3065, S.B. 1504) (the "Act")
legislation for a number of reasons.

- Overstepping Authority: I'm not in opposition to energy stewardship such as wind power--- but in opposition to the legislation and loss of authority for local Boards serving numerous communities. The existing legislation and performance criteria are in place for sound reasons and protections.
- Siting lacks a responsible stewardship approach Map of Massachusetts potential sites http://www.mass.gov/Eoea/docs/doer/renewables/wind/index_map_state.pdf

First- the list of potential sites fails to take into account the fact of extensive transmission line loss over distances. If siting is considered with need, than alternatives such as harnessing energy of the water/wind flow of the Quabbin to Wachusett areas, and, the extensive surplus of wind energy should be taken into account. The existing potential for siting locations, reusing existing landfills (along with State restrictions on site access of the land) already exist without having to overstep local Zoning and Planning Boards authority.

Second: the location of generation source-to-end user is shortened and the energy generated could help defray the energy costs of bringing water to the densely populated portion of the State, and, help to lower water rates for ratepayer communitites.

Third-the electric network is located at the Wachusett and Quabbin regions already with numerous transmission lines. And ample elevated locations across the entire Mass Turnpike and rest area lands. Utilizing these areas first would defray costs of having to slice a swath through the most scenic vistas of the State, and destroy a tourism industry strongly dependent upon scenic vista integrity.

Fourth: -the idea of the single-source board having enough local tribal

knowledge across the state, replacing a knowledge base of well over 2,000 individuals sitting on Zoning, Conservation, Health and Planning Boards, negates common sense. Individuals serving on their Boards take their responsibility seriously and do what's best for their communities. Failing to utilize that knowledge base and trample upon a permitting process that was put in place for sound reasons, is nothing short of foolish. The idea of single source permitting has surfaced numerous times before, perpetuated by the PACs and industry officials looking for fast track permits for landfills, and most recently zoning has been attacked for rail-to-waste companies attempting to skirt a process that's in place for protecting residents. As a former appointed Board Member of Citizens Planners Training Collaborative, I find this proposal extremely dangerous and irresponsible for all concerned, except the proponent.

Fifth-there already are ways to build facilities within the process without side-stepping local authorities.

It could be argued that , Chapter 164: Section 69K1/2, CHAPTER 40A. ZONING regulations already allow for the industry to meet a speedy acceptance.

I believe that proponents are missing a great opportunity by failing to utilize any old large industrial contaminated Brownfields first. The benefit would be a speedy clean up, limited exposure to anyone on possible contamination, and a taxable use for a dormant resource. At the same time we'd keep our preservation lands pristine and have industrial lands that use the wind energy for generating their own power.

The siting could also be done on numerous golf courses instead of state forest-since they have a stronger wind potential with limited trees already, and, since most are dormant several months out of the year they'd add the advantage of revenue to the owners.

Other sources such as old airports would be ideal such as Worcester Airport, Hanscom, Fort Devens, Otis etc. Most have old challenges with Brownfields within and are in the process of developing new energy needing industry.

Why trash our pristine forest? Why not put Deer Island on wind turbines? Springfield is awash in Brownfields as are many communities throughout the state.

Why not use the already cleared lands already paved over or capped for contaminants and off the tax rolls?

Where's the stewardship and common sense?

Here's how they should be looking at the challenge. First start with existing problems that this will fix such as
North Adams Landfill

DEP 21 E lands mapped across the state which could easily be overlaid against the topos

<http://www.mass.gov/mgis/mapping.htm#21E>

AND cross checked against the locations below.

http://yosemite.epa.gov/r1/npl_pad.nsf/SelectedByState?OpenForm&View=Massachusetts

Where's the process for doing that? You've also got GE's cleanup site. If that's not enough- look at using the median strip on the Mass Pike higher elevation from Westborough to New York-as well as the Pike large sized paved rest areas-where there's already noise, open space and traffic that doesn't lose aesthetics such as new sites would cause.

In closing I oppose this legislation and request that it be stopped. We have enough resources available without prostituting State Resource lands.

Yours truly
Charles Michael Toomey